UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Sanctions—and Lake Tsana - - - - - *Reginald A. Reynolds*

Marshall, Jefferson and the Constitution - - - - - *Isidore A. Blanch*

When Is a War Not a War? - - - - - *Henry W. Pinkham*

A Great Indian Ruler - *Jabez T. Sunderland*

Travel Letters—I - - *Alson H. Robinson*

In Memory of May Johnson - *Amelia Sears*

The Study Table - *George Maychin Stockdale, E. J. Chave, Charles Lyttle, Charles A. Hawley, John Haynes Holmes, Robert C. Schaller*

VOLUME CXVI NUMBER 10

Chicago, January 20, 1936

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly Until Further Notice — *Subscription $3.00 Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* — CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY
JAMES H. WEST

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 183
Jottings—J. H. H. 186

ARTICLES—
Truth and Repose—*Ralph Waldo Emerson* 183
Sanctions—and Lake Tsana—REGINALD A. REYNOLDS 186
Anna Louise Strong 187
Marshall, Jefferson and the Constitution—ISIDORE A. BLANCH 188
When Is a War Not a War?—HENRY W. PINKHAM 189
Travel Letters—I—ALSON H. ROBINSON 191
In Memory of May Johnson—AMELIA SEARS 192
A Great Indian Ruler—JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND 193

POETRY—
Prayer to the God of Lesser Evils—R. A. REYNOLDS 193
Three in One—FLORA WHITE 193

THE STUDY TABLE—
Book Reviews—GEORGE MAYCHIN STOCKDALE 194
Portrait of Jesus—E. J. CHAVE 196
Progressive Religious Education—CHARLES LYTTLE 196
America's Debt to Göttingen—CHARLES A. HAWLEY 197
Protest Against War—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 197
The Witches' Sabbath—ROBERT C. SCHALLER 198

CORRESPONDENCE—
A Tribute to May Johnson—ROBERT WHITAKER 198
A Reply to Mr. Brown on Sanctions—EDWARD M. WINSTON 199

THE FIELD—
Dr. Charles Strong of Australia—SYDNEY STRONG 182
Gandhi Receives Margaret Sanger—*National Committee on Federal Legislation for Birth Control* 200
Woman's Suffrage—*Carolina M. Hill in The American Friend* 200

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Dr. Charles Strong of Australia

The Australian Church of Melbourne, of which Dr. Charles Strong, a contributing editor of UNITY, has been the pastor for fifty years, held its Jubilee Celebrations last November. For half a century, this Church, under Dr. Strong, has been "amongst the pioneers" in movements for religious freedom; for the interpretation and expression of religion in the light of modern knowledge; for the practical application of the teachings of Jesus to individual and social life; and for the establishment of social justice, international peace and understanding.

Forty-five years ago, the young pastor (Dr. Strong is now over 80) uttered these words in a sermon:

> We do not exist to propagate a theological creed, to make proselytes, or to advance some little sectarian cause. We do not wish to propagate some little newfangled doctrine of our own. Our aim, if we are true to the Gospel, is to foster among ourselves, and to awaken and strengthen in others, the rational, social, spiritual self. The real test of our sermons and services, and of any work which we try to do among our fellow-citizens, is this: Are they helping men and women and children to come to themselves, opening up to them the depths of their own natures, and the possibilities of their souls? Keep this aim steadily before you.

The Australian Church for all these fifty years has supported or organized work for Child Welfare, Slum Abolition, Maternity and Prison Reform, Anti-Sweatshop League, Temperance Cause, the Unemployed, Peace Movement. It has published a monthly magazine, called the COMMONWEAL—with Dr. Strong as Editor. The purpose behind the Church has been that not he that speaketh the Word, but he that doeth the Will, is approved!

During all these years, Dr. Strong has been a conspicuous and glorious champion of peace. He was constantly and openly in his pulpit and out of it, opposed to the Boer War, also to the Great War. His church helped to give to Australia conspicuous labor legislation—among this being the 48-hour week (forty years ago), arbitration of industrial disputes. The right of collective bargaining was conceded years and years ago! Australia often has a "Labor Government." The Australian Church was prominent in bringing such conditions to pass. It is a

(Continued on Page 200)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXVI MONDAY, JANUARY 20, 1936 No. 10

TRUTH AND REPOSE

"God offers to every mind its choice between truth and repose. ✢ He in whom the love of repose predominates will accept the first creed, the first philosophy, the first political party he meets,—most likely his father's. ✢ ✢ He in whom the love of truth predominates will keep himself aloof from all moorings and afloat. ✢ ✢ ✢ He submits to the inconvenience of suspense and imperfect opinion, but he is a candidate for truth, as the other is not, and respects the highest law of his being."

—Ralph Waldo Emerson.

NATIONALISM AND INTERNATIONALISM

Let us have some clear thinking on this matter of nationalism and internationalism! We are never going to have any real internationalism and therefore any lasting peace so long as the nation as such is regarded by men as primary, final in authority and interest, or fundamentally important at all. We tried here in America to make the separate states of the Union to be superior to the federal system, and we all but lost our unity as a consequence. The United States is secure today because the states are really united in the conviction that no one of them is important except in relation to the union of them all. The states, in other words, have been definitely subordinated to the nation. Now, in exactly the same way, in the larger field of the world, the nations must be combined into an international system or order which shall be definitely recognized as superior to any one of them, large or small, powerful or weak. Today it is Italy, or Germany, or Russia, or even America, which is of central and final importance in the eyes of its citizens. Hence nationalism is running riot, and war rather than peace is the prospect of the future. Nationalism is international anarchy. The hour waits for the statesman who can lead mankind outside the borders of the separate states to the common meeting ground of world-wide human fraternity. The same thing, let it be added, is true of race! So long as men talk about superior and inferior races, and the purity of the blood stream, and all that, just so long will there be prejudice, and hatred, and disunity among men. The Nordic *mythus* as directed against the Jew in Germany is in no way different from the white-man psychology as directed against the Negro in America. Unless all religion is wrong, there is "one God and Father of all." Unless all science is wrong, the widespread multitudes of men upon this earth have sprung from a single stock. In any case, it is elementary that so long as race-consciousness intrudes upon the human mind, all hope of a united world must be suspended. In other words, we cannot have our cake and eat it, too. We cannot divide men along nationalistic and racial lines, and at the same time unite them in one universal brotherhood. A little clear thinking on this point would explain most of the difficulties of our time, and show the way in which we should walk if civilization is to be saved.

ITALY BUT NOT JAPAN

Europe buckles down to the business of restraining Mussolini in Ethiopia and ending his war there, while Japan sweeps on unmolested in her conquest of China. It would be good to know why the nations of the earth as united in the League are so concerned about the one situation and so indifferent to the other. In essence the two are the same—one member of the League making war upon another, which is about as disreputable a proceeding as can be imagined. If there is any difference, it is rather in favor of Italy than otherwise. Certainly it is Japan that has longest defied or ignored the League, and it is Japan that offers a militaristic menace beyond anything that Mussolini can muster to threaten humankind. Thus, if Japan once gets firm possession of China, after the pattern of Britain in India, for example, she will straightway become the supreme imperialist power of the world. In China she will find abundant natural resources and raw materials, a market for her manufactured products of immeasurable extent, a mass of cheap labor for any enterprise, and a supply of soldiery to overrun the globe. One can see Mussolini embarrassed and weakened and in the end, perhaps, even overthrown by his mad adventure in Africa, but before Japan in China one can see nothing but triumph, not so much as an end in itself as a means toward greater and more dreadful ends. And the League of Nations does nothing, and Britain looses no ministers in any crisis! It is all very strange, and hardly to be explained by the fact that Japan is far away and Italy near at hand. The real secret, we imagine, lies in Europe, which is a powder magazine, liable to be exploded at any moment by the Ethiopian sparks. But this is a curiously short-sighted view to

take of things, for while Italy's depredations may mean war tomorrow, Japan's depredations assuredly mean war next year. Russia knows this latter fact full well, and therefore feels an anxiety to the east so great that she is all but indifferent to European affairs. America should know it, also. Yet we have no eastern policy worthy of the name. We only drift, drift, with the roar of the falls not far away.

TAKING OVER THE COAL MINES

We wonder what would be said in this country if President Roosevelt should announce that he had decided to take over the coal mines into government ownership and thus expropriate their private owners. No, on second thought, we don't wonder at all. We *know!* If such announcement were made from Washington there would arise such anger, denunciation, terror, as no Florida hurricane or Kansas cyclone could match. "Bolshevik," "Red," "revolutionist," "traitor," would be among the least of the epithets hurled at the head of the unfortunate President. Why, even the Guffey Act, applying certain rudimentary standards of labor to the coal industry in this country, has aroused a storm of opposition and abuse from American citizens. This Act is going to be fought to the limit in the courts. From this we can judge what would happen if government ownership should be suggested. Yet, without a particle of furor, with no opposition that we can discover, as a mere matter of routine business, the Tory government of England, Stanley Baldwin, Premier, has announced its decision to take over all the coal mines of the Kingdom and operate them as a national enterprise for the use and service of all the people! Ever since the famous Sankey inquiry, this step has seemed inevitable. Not otherwise could ruinous competition be eliminated, disastrous waste ended, and decent labor conditions established. And now the English are going to take the step, by action not of the Laborites but of the Tories, and everybody seems to be content. Theory, in other words, prejudice, dogmatism, are not allowed to operate in the English mind in a case of this kind. These cousins of ours simply face a situation as it is, do what has to be done, and then pass on to the next item of business. And, in the process, vast revolutions are achieved with no violence or bloodshed, with scarcely even a tremor of disturbance. What is there in the English genius which works this miracle? Why can't Americans be equally sensible and efficient? We do not know. But that the English, at home and abroad, are the greatest masters of government, since the Romans, is obvious.

THE CONSUMER THE FORGOTTEN MAN

From the beginning of the depression, UNITY has insisted that the only way out is the *production of plenty and the reduction of prices to the lowest possible level.* Mr. Roosevelt has put into effect in the last three years a program exactly contrary to this—the production of scarcity and the raising of prices! This policy, like a hypodermic injection, may cause, and is now causing, a momentary improvement, but means in the end increasing misery and complete collapse. It is because we have seen this that we have had to accompany our praise of the man, for his high spirit and determination, with a rejection of the whole philosophy and program of his administration. Of course, we have not taken ourselves over-seriously—UNITY cannot pose as an economic or political authority! But we have seemed to find common sense in our idea—and now comes a genuine authority to back it up! This authority is none other than the great economist Dr. Harold G. Moulton, in his recent use of the reports and statistics of the Brookings Institute. It is Dr. Moulton's contention that the key to the whole depression problem, under the existing system, is the consumer. To reach this consumer and enable him to function, there is only one thing to do, and that is to make prices *so low* that he can buy whatever he needs, or even wants. It is Dr. Moulton's idea that the consumer has never consumed what he is easily able and eagerly happy to consume. Our trouble, in other words, is not overproduction at all, but underconsumption—just what we have been arguing right along! And here is the President moving heaven and earth and the U. S. Constitution, to cut down production and boost all prices sky high! Which means another period of "prosperity" in terms of profits for the few and poverty for the many, with another depression just around the corner! It seems too crazy to be true. But wait, dear reader, till you pay your food and rent bills a few months hence, and then you'll find it true enough. *Plenty* is the watchword—plenty which will put prices so low that they will end profits. That's the "way out"!

DOES DR. TOWNSEND KNOW HOW TO FIGURE?

Contrary to expectation a year ago, the Townsend Plan is developing into a movement of formidable political proportions. It is not unlikely that the founder of the Plan and his followers may determine the outcome of the presidential election in 1936. Failing this, they are almost certain to control a measure of support in the new Congress which may make legislation inevitable. This situation would be irresistibly comic if it were not so terribly tragic, for the Townsend Plan, as naively absurd a proposal as ever emanated from the so-called human brain, is from every practical point of view a menace of truly gigantic proportions. All one needs is a pencil and paper, a few statistics, and a little arithmetical knowledge, to prove the incredibly impossible nature of the Townsend proposal. The gist of the idea is that the government shall pay to every citizen over 60 years of age a monthly pension of $200. This means, roughly speaking, that the government

shall supply the old people of the country with an annual income of $24,000,000,000. In order to pay this enormous sum of money, the government must first, of course, get the money, for the Plan provides that the $200 per month per person must be spent during the month in which it is received. This is no credit transaction, therefore, but *cash*—real money received and expended! Dr. Townsend would get this money, this cash, by levying a 2 per cent tax on every buy-and-sell operation in the nation's business. This seems easy and feasible until it is inconveniently recalled that the total national income—the whole amount of wealth actually produced in the country—was $48,000,000,000 in 1934, and only $80,000,000,000 in the heyday of 1929. So the Plan means that, for the raising of the *cash* to be paid over to his old folks, Dr. Townsend would take in taxes not from 2 to 5 per cent of all the income of the land, but from 25 to 50 per cent. This proves instantly and conclusively the fantastic nature of the proposal. What it ignores is the fact that money cannot be conjured up out of nothing. Money spent has first to be money earned. All wealth has to be produced by labor—and Dr. Townsend's Plan makes no provision for the production of the wealth he's got to have. It's a lovely dream, and that's all. A *dream!*

RUSSIA'S WAR ON BOOZE

Walter Duranty cables from Moscow that Soviet Russia is winning her fight against liquor. In 1935 the consumption of vodka was only 3.6 liters per capita, whereas in 1913 the figure stood at 8.1 liters. Compared with 1931, production of vodka has fallen 12.7 per cent; and compared with 1913, it has fallen 43.2 per cent; and this despite an increase in population of about 40,000,000. It is to be remembered, in all fairness, that the Bolsheviks tried Prohibition, and gave it up. But these same Bolsheviks were not so "dumb," so inane, so silly, so stupid, so absurd, as to resort to Repeal and thus to unleash the commercialized liquor traffic upon a deluded and helpless people. On the contrary, the government, with familiar realism, took over the sale of "booze" as a national responsibility, and then started such an anti-liquor propaganda campaign as this world has never seen. With every conceivable medium of publicity at its disposal, the government undertook to teach the people *not to drink*. In the theaters and over the radio, especially through enormous and striking posters displayed on billboards, in railroad stations and public buildings, in recreation centers and trade union centers, the folly and the crime of drink were vividly portrayed. In all the schools, of course, the children were rigorously instructed in total abstinence. Even in the cafés and drinking places, the evils of alcoholic beverages were shouted from every wall and on every table. It was wasteful to drink; it was fatal to good health and efficient labor to drink; it was a betrayal of the nation to drink! These were the truths proclaimed in legends and pictures of unforgettable significance. Rather different from this country, where every conceivable device of publicity is placed fully at the disposal of the private-profit-making liquor interests to debauch the people into unrestrained intoxication! Comparative results are impressive—in America, a people fast becoming the champion boozers of the world, and in Russia a people fast being cleansed of the defilement of this poisoned drug! Which nation will win out in the competition of the future must be obvious even to a drunken automobile driver trying to pass another car on the curved slope of a hill.

DAME CHRISTABEL PANKHURST

Our mind keeps going back to the naming of Christabel Pankhurst on the King's New Year's list for honors in the British Empire. What a whirligig of fortune within the period of a single generation! We refuse to believe that we are old, yet we can easily remember when the Pankhursts, mother and daughters, were among the most hated and feared of all persons in English public life. Indeed, in the days before the War, these indomitable women held first place in the opprobrium as well as the attention of the English people. Their names were associated with sensational and dangerous acts. Again and again they were arrested, tried, and cast into prison. For their jailers they made all manner of trouble, including the notorious "hunger-strikes." The Pankhursts thinking that the time had come for woman suffrage, and no fooling, simply went to work in forthright fashion to gain their objective—and they succeeded! Whether they would have succeeded as and when they did will always remain an open question, for the intervention of the War changed everything. But this one thing is certain, and that is that Mrs. Pankhurst and her daughters dramatized the woman suffrage situation into life, made the issue their own, and by suffering and sacrifice made its favorable outcome inevitable. Here were genuine reformers of the old-time heroic breed. Courage was their weapon, martyrdom their reward. But they won their victory; and, best of all, they lived to see it won. And lo, they are ranked among the great of England! In London, today, stands the beautiful statue of Mrs. Pankhurst, to rival attention and reverence with the statue of Edith Cavell. And now, as though King George could not remember days when the Pankhursts were anathema, he makes Christabel a Dame, an honor equivalent to knighthood! There is a justice in this action which is profoundly moving. Credit belongs to the donor as well as to the recipient—the King and his ministers are honored along with Christabel herself. Once again, in a sorely troubled world, we find something that seems to be right.

"So shines a good deed in a naughty world."

Jottings

Famous dead of 1935, who passed away after our list (published in the last issue) was compiled, include: LORD READING, statesman of England; SENATOR T. C. SCHALL, of Minnesota; PAUL BOURGET, French novelist; CLARENCE DAY, American author; ROBERT LORAINE, English actor; and SOPHIE BRESLAU, American singer.

"Al" Smith can't be President himself, but he may make or break Presidents. How many millions of excited citizens will be listening in to his address on January 25th, the first bombshell of the 1936 campaign?

The Eskimos of Alaska, according to the Associated Press, have begun "a new Prohibition campaign." Thus, the natives have petitioned for a re-enactment of Prohibition statutes making it a crime even to give an Eskimo a drink of liquor, for "the excessive use of intoxicating liquor by Eskimos is highly demoralizing to the race."

This strikes us as good logic and sound morals. Liquor is "demoralizing," therefore, get rid of it! The white man may well imitate the wisdom of his Eskimo brother.

It is announced that the $4,000,000,000 federal work relief fund will be exhausted by July 1st next. We doubt it! It will last until Election Day, at least. Farley will see to that.

When political thugs in Tampa, Florida, kidnapped and whipped three political opponents, the ministers rose up and held a public meeting of penitence and protest. When army officials in Syracuse, N. Y., proposed to use Burnet Park for a gas mask demonstration, the ministers rose up and defeated the suggestion. Good for the ministers!

Lindbergh has shamed us with the truth. If we were honest, we would revise the national anthem and, instead of "the land of the free and the home of the brave," would sing:

"The land of the gangster and
The home of the racketeer."

J. H. H.

Sanctions—and Lake Tsana

REGINALD A. REYNOLDS

[Our Special Correspondent in England]

The peril of world war once more overshadows the conflict in Abyssinia.

Unseasonal rains have dislocated the Italian armies in the South. There have been unexpected reverses. Attempted "agreements" (for carving up Abyssinia) have broken down once more, and the Powers at Geneva are facing the exasperated imperialism of Italy.

Their latest blow is the shrewdest. In the last war Clemenceau told the United States Government that oil would be "as necessary as blood in the battles of tomorrow." Italy has hardly any oil supplies of her own, and now her rivals propose to cut her off from the supplies they control. *But Italy may strike back before this "sanction" can become effective.*

The policy of our Government is neither one of "sanctions and security" (as its spokesmen would have us believe) nor is it the crude unconditional complicity with Italy which the *Daily Worker* (in defiance of all the facts) has attempted to make of it. British policy has been, and still is, to force an agreement with Italy if possible, so as to protect British capitalist interests. But failing such an agreement the Government's policy is one of "sanctions" up to and including war with Italy if necessary.

What are these "interests" we may so soon be asked to defend? What are the realities behind the idealistic phrases of the Labor Party leaders, the recruiting sergeants of the last war who are so busily preparing us for the next one?

Prominent in the picture is Lake Tsana, the lake in Abyssinian territory where the Blue Nile rises. According to the Royal Institute of International Affairs, this lake is "Great Britain's chief consideration in Abyssinia." There is not only the fear that the waters of the Blue Nile might be diverted by an unfriendly Power which got control of Lake Tsana, but there is the long-standing British plan to construct a dam there in order to irrigate the cotton fields of the Soudan. By the treaties of 1891, 1894, 1902 and 1906 Britain obtained recognition of a "sphere of influence" around this lake, all these treaties except that of 1902 being made with other Powers over the head of the Ethiopian Government.

In 1919 Italy offered to support Britain in obtaining a special concession from Abyssinia in order to dam the Blue Nile at Lake Tsana. But there was a fly in the ointment; for in return the Italians wanted a big increase of their own "influence" in Western Abyssinia. This would have given Italy the master card in any future conflict that might have arisen; for not only does Lake Tsana itself lie in the northwest of Abyssinia, surrounded by what would have become an Italian protectorate, but a little to the South, within the proposed Italian sphere, lies the River Sobat, an important tributary of the White Nile. The Sobat had been one of the subjects of the 1902 treaty, by which Abyssinia had promised not to permit any construction that would divert it from its source.

Whitehall, therefore, rejected the Italian offer of 1919 "owing to the strong objection felt to the idea of allowing a foreign Power to establish any sort of control over the head waters of rivers so vital to the prosperity and even to the existence of Egypt and the Soudan." This reason they gave themselves when renewing nego-

tiations in 1925. This time an agreement was reached, based upon the Italian note of 1919, but with the addition of a provision that Italy should undertake not to tamper with the waterflow into the main Nile river.

The 1925 agreement with Italy was kept secret till June, 1926, when a protest by the Ethiopian Government brought it before the League of Nations. An Abyssinian note to the British Government said: "We should never have suspected that the British Government would come to an agreement with another government regarding our lake." France, cut out from the Anglo-Italian intrigue, backed Abyssinia; and the statesmen at London and Rome explained themselves away as gracefully as possible.

What caused the breach between our government and that of Italy? Why did the policy of Whitehall and the government press (particularly the *Daily Telegraph*) swing around during the spring of 1935 from a pro-Italian to a qualified "sanctionist" attitude?

Lake Tsana once more helps us to find the answer. On May 10th the Abyssinian Government, scared at the lack of support it was getting at Geneva (and perhaps "tipped off" discreetly as to the price of British good will) communicated with the governments of Britain, Egypt and the Soudan. It seemed that Britain was interested in a dam at Lake Tsana, that surveys had even been made in 1930 and 1933 to investigate the practical requirements of damming the Nile, but that up till this time Addis Ababa had refused the necessary "concession." They were now, strange to say, willing to discuss the matter.

Mussolini counter-attacked immediately. He drew British attention to the 1906 Treaty and the exchange of notes in 1925. If the Ethiopian Government were now willing to grant a concession for the barrage at Lake Tsana, then Britain must fulfill her part of the various thieves' agreements and support the Italian demand for a trans-Ethiopian railway and an economic sphere of influence over the rest of the country. In this predicament British policy followed a triple course.

Firstly, Mr. Eden gave a public assurance that Britain, fearing to aggravate the dispute with Italy, would postpone any agreement with Abyssinia regarding the Tsana barrage. (Hansard 9.7.1935. p. 154.)

Secondly, Mr. Eden at Rome made offers for the partitioning of Abyssinia. These included an offer to cede a strip of British territory and a port to Abyssinia (in "compensation" for territory to be handed over to Italy).

It may be safely assumed that the British imperialists (with Lake Tsana in mind) intended themselves to get as good as they gave. Their offers, however, did not satisfy Mussolini.

Thirdly, the Egyptian Government, notwithstanding Mr. Eden's assurance to the British Parliament, had already proceeded to appropriate twenty-one million pounds (Egyptian) for irrigation purposes *which included the Tsana barrage.* This decision was approved on May 22d—less than a fortnight after the Abyssinian offer was made.

From the breakdown of Eden's negotiations with Mussolini at Rome begins the stiffening of British policy at Geneva. Italy must only be allowed to conquer Abyssinia on terms or not at all. Britain's stake was now a big one, and matters came to a head with the breakdown of the most recent "negotiations" for sharing out Abyssinia. Then the Italian advance threatened Tsana itself.

Under the heading, "Peril to British Water Supply," the *Sunday Referee* of November 17th informed us that "the announcement of an advance towards Lake Tsana, whose waters feed the River Nile, is causing alarm to British interests in the Soudan and Egypt." The *Referee* then reported an interview with an official of the Egyptian legation who said:

> Before the War started the Egyptian Government was discussing with Abyssinia a project for building an irrigation system around the lake to control the output of water so essential to Egypt's prosperity.
>
> If the lake comes under Italian control this scheme may have to be abandoned.
>
> A hostile attitude on the part of Italy would have very serious consequences for the Egyptian cultivator.

It is not, however, the Egyptian cultivator whose interests concern our government. It is the British capital that has been invested in Egypt and the Soudan, and the possibility of further profitable "development" of these countries if the Abyssinian highlands in their rear can be made safe against rival imperialists.

Lake Tsana is by no means the only capitalist interest over which Britain and Italy are at loggerheads, though it has become a matter of acute importance. British imperialists are anxious about the safety of other possessions if Mussolini gets control of Abyssinia. The Soudan itself and Egypt (which is no more independent of Britain than Manchukuo is independent of Japan) would be at Italy's mercy. Already in Egypt a revival of intense agitation against British control has frightened our capitalist class. What would happen to Suez if the Egyptian nationalists made common cause with Italy in their desperate struggle against Britain? The route to India, the keystone of the British Empire, would be threatened by a rival Power which openly challenges British control of the Eastern Mediterranean and the Red Sea. All of which explains why the delegates at the League Assembly had to stuff their handkerchiefs into their mouths while Sir Samuel Hoare was talking about the disinterestedness of his government.

Such are the considerations which have induced our Government to throw all its force into the policy of sanctions, and to take the risk of war with Italy. It is for British capitalist interests that Abyssinia is to be "defended" while Japan is allowed to digest North China at her leisure. And that is why the oil supplies which we stole (by methods exactly similar to those now used by Mussolini) are to be withheld from Italy. For the last war brought us the Mosul oil fields as part of our "sacred trust"; and at Haifa, where the oil pipes reach the sea, lies a strong squadron of British ships. Guardians of the spoils of war? Of course not—they are the policemen of Geneva, who make the world safe for British capitalism.

Anna Louise Strong

It will interest her friends to know that Miss Strong is now in America and may be addressed in care of Henry Holt & Company, Publishers, 1 Park Avenue, New York City.

Miss Strong will be available for lectures in the East and Middle West until the end of February, spending March on the Pacific Coast—starting with California and working northward to Seattle, where she will be during the latter part of March. Her lecture itinerary is managed by the *Open Forum Speakers Bureau,* Milfred C. Smith, Executive Secretary, 80 Boylston Street, Boston, Mass.

Marshall, Jefferson and the Constitution

ISIDORE A. BLANCH

The famous French critic and admirer of liberal institutions, De Tocqueville, speaking of the formation of the American Constitution, said: "In that land the great experiment was to be made by a civilized people of the attempt to construct society on a new basis." Yet the makers of the federal Constitution were not visionaries. They were practical men, men who took counsel in the political experiments of the past and who did not ignore the difficulties and conflict of interests in the age in which they lived.

The system of two legislative bodies, the separation of the government into three distinct branches, as well as the adoption of the Common Law, are influences traceable to the English system of government. The outstanding feature of the federal Constitution, however, constitutes a bold experiment in representative government.

Up to 1789 the federal government was merely the creature of the states composing it. The novelty created by the Constitution was three-fold: (1) limited government and the people kept the sovereignty, (2) dual system of government between the state and the nation, (3) central government which operated directly on the individual citizen. John Fiske, the historian, characterized the Constitution as "one of the longest reaches in civilized statesmanship ever known in the world."

The delegates to the Constitutional Convention of 1789, having disposed of the tyranny of the British crown, showed the fear of a new tyranny, the tyranny of the majority, the spirit of the mob. So they endeavored to set up constitutional guaranties against the very government which they created and against which future office-holders should not be able to transgress.

Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton were the two leaders of the opposing factions in the Constitutional Convention. Jefferson fought for individual guaranties. Hamilton argued that the Constitution itself was a true Bill of Rights and that specifications of additional rights and liberties were not necessary. Jefferson, however, was the leader of the movement that demanded a Bill of Rights in the Constitution. Though he was in Paris at the time on a government mission, he kept in touch with the Convention and urged that several states should withhold ratification until a declaration of rights was annexed, stipulating freedom of religion, freedom of press, freedom of commerce from monopolies, no suspension of habeas corpus, and no standing army.

The advice of James Madison, the moderate, prevailed, and the Constitution was ratified by the states with the understanding that a Bill of Rights would be added later. Within three years after the ratification of the Constitution, Madison introduced the first ten amendments to the Constitution, embodying all the guaranties of a Bill of Rights.

The first eight amendments may be classified into two groups—those designed to protect personal liberty and those designed to protect against the arbitrary taking of private property. In the first group are guaranties of freedom of speech, and press, and freedom of religion, freedom of assembly, and safeguards around persons accused of crime. In the second group are guaranties against unlawful seizures and searches, and provision for compensation for private property when taken by the goverment for a public use.

The American Constitution as thus framed was once described by Gladstone as "the most wonderful work ever struck off by the brain and purpose of man." This, however, was said by Gladstone a generation after its adoption. At the beginning of the nation's political history, it had little promise and was nothing more than a charter of liberties. The United States as a nation in 1789 was a loose and undefined entity, and the position of the bodies of government was to be established in the public mind and defined in legal and Constitutional terms. It took the creative mind of John Marshall to work that out. Except for John Marshall, who became Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court at that critical period, it is doubtful whether the United States as a nation would have achieved its political strength and virility, and particularly whether the Supreme Court would have assumed the importance that it soon came to assume.

At the time of the appointment of John Marshall, in 1801, the Supreme Court was considered the weakest branch of the American government—weaker than the President and weaker than Congress. John Jay, the first Chief Justice, refused reappointment at that time on the ground that he was convinced that the Supreme Court could never acquire proper weight and dignity. Beginning in 1801, Marshall became the sole mouthpiece of the Court. All opinions were delivered by him. For eleven years the opinions of the Supreme Court were almost exclusively his. The task of expounding the Constitution fell upon Marshall.

In the case of Marbury vs. Madison he laid down the law for the first time in that he declared an Act of Congress unconstitutional and thereby set a precedent of judicial supremacy which perhaps had the most far-reaching consequences in American history. In Cohen vs. Virginia he denied the right of a state court to try an action involving a federal officer, and thereby set a precedent of the supremacy of the United States courts over the courts of the states. In McCoulough vs. Maryland, he set the Constitutional precedent that no state can tax property of the United States, and thereby laid down a principle of national sovereignty at a time when the sovereignty of the United States was questioned and undetermined. In all, Marshall decided forty-four cases involving Constitutional interpretation. The Constitution in its most important aspects is now as Marshall interpreted it. He established the position of federal legislature and federal judiciary.

Marshall, of course, had no simple task. He had to convince the American people and interpret the Constitution according to its logical meaning in order to accomplish that. The chief characteristic of his opinions is the cumulative force of the argument. His logic is inexorable. There is little or no repetition, a wealth of illustration, a

completeness of analysis which convinces that the subject has not only been adequately treated but that it has been exhausted. Marshall's opinions, though very interesting, rest on the argument rather than on the language. So synonymous have the opinions of Chief Justice Marshall become with the Constitution that, when a lawyer wants to refer to a point of Constitutional law, he almost invariably quotes Marshall.

Marshall's assertion of the supremacy of the Supreme Court over Congress has had from nowhere more implacable opposition than from Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence. Jefferson considered the assumption of supremacy of judicial authority as a monstrous perversion of the Constitution. On one occasion he wrote of the Supreme Court judges, "They are an irresponsible body, working like gravity, by night and day, gain a little today and a little tomorrow, and advancing its noiseless step like a thief over the field of jurisdiction, until all shall be usurped from the states and the government of all be consolidated into one." It is doubtful if one could write such remarks today without being cited for contempt of court. In 1824 he wrote to W. H. Torrence: "Whether the judges are invested with executive authority to decide on the constitutionality of a law has been heretofore a subject of consideration with me in the exercise of official duties. Certainly there is not one word in the Constitution which gives that power to them more than to the executive or legislative branches." On another occasion he wrote of the Supreme Court judges: "They are sappers and miners, steadily working underground to undermine the independent rights of the states to consolidate all power in the hands of that government in which they hold a freehold estate." The New York *Times* quoted recently former Solicitor-General James M. Beck as having used identical language in characterizing advocates of a liberal interpretation of the Constitution in its application to social legislation. How ironical that Jefferson's words should be used as advocacy for the overriding of Congress by the Supreme Court! The overzealous devotees of the Constitution who resort to Jefferson for their guardianship of "economic freedom" are apt to find themselves grasping the horse by the tail instead of riding it at the crest of the neck.

The fifty-eight lawyers who constituted themselves self-appointed judicial counsellors on the Wagner Labor Relations Act, and the Sir Gallahads of the Liberty League who offer to save us "constitutionally" from the menace of social legislation, remind me of a story that I heard some time ago. They say that way out in New Zealand there is a stout timber tree called the *rimu*. Around it may be seen sometimes curling a gray flowing creeper called the *rata*. I was told that the clinging *rata* waxes stronger and thicker and eventually kills the *rimu*, for all its pride and seeming might. After all, Jefferson's theories flowed from a mainspring of idealism, and, in the face of the problems now confronting the people of the United States, Jefferson would very likely be an advocate of furtherance of federal authority as he was an uncompromising foe before modern conditions gave rise to present day social and economic problems.

When Is War Not a War?

HENRY W. PINKHAM

The application of sanctions to Italy by the League, the first case in the nearly sixteen years of the League's existence, has caused some of even the most outspoken pacifists to waver, or—as they prefer to say—to "rethink their positions." Sherwood Eddy, for example, has for years from many platforms declared that he will never endorse a war. But now, approving the economic pressure on Italy, he thinks a blockade may prove necessary, and if there should follow an Italian attack on the blockading powers, as Mussolini has threatened, he would favor "defending the point or points attacked." He would not call such defending "war," but rather the exercise of "the police power of the League under judicial action for collective security with the minimum controlled use of force for the protection of life and property."

This position is substantially that of many pacifists who have hitherto been regarded as unqualified. Rev. George L. Paine, chairman of the Boston branch of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, said recently: "I am opposed to all wars but one—the war that is not a war, but the use of force by duly constituted authority against a violent lawbreaker."

There is unquestionably an important difference between, on the one hand, armed conflict of one nation with another, each, at least one, determined to have its way with the other by superior might, unwilling to submit its quarrel to a neutral authority; and, on the other hand, an attempt to restrain by armed force an aggressor nation and to protect its victim, a collective attempt made in accordance with an international agreement and in pursuance of judgment by an impartial tribunal. It is not surprising that many devoted workers for peace approve the latter kind of war. The late Dr. Edward Cummings, of the World Peace Foundation, said that such would be a "holy war." The term usually applied to it is "international policing." For everybody believes in policing.

Called by whatever name, military and naval sanctions executed by the faith-keeping members of the League against a Covenant-breaker, in obedience to the Covenant and in devotion to international justice, would signify a long step away from the anarchy of unlimited national sovereignty toward world organization. But it is not yet proved that any nation will ever use its armed forces for that good cause unless its own self-interest is believed to be also involved. The United States refused to promise to engage in this altruistic warfare in support of law and justice, declining to join the League. The countries that joined promised, indeed, but they have not performed. In 1931 China pleaded in vain for aid against Japanese aggression. Until the Italo-Ethiopian affair there was every reason to conclude that the Covenant sanctions were a dead letter. That affair, one may hope, will at least and at last afford a decisive test of them.

Mere economic and financial pressure on a faith-breaking nation, if severe and prolonged, could not fail to check its war-fever. For no country is self-sufficient. But a boycott hurts both parties to it. It offers extraordinary profits to traders that violate it. Hence it is exceedingly difficult to maintain. It is likely to prove ineffectual except in actual war, to which it is almost certain to lead. Once bloodshed has begun, it becomes impossible to limit the use of force to "a minimum for the protection of life and property," for collective homicide is not a business that can be carried on with calmness and moderation. And unfortunately, it is, in our infinitely complex civilization, a very contagious business. There is much ground for the contention of Frank H. Simonds that the League's method of stopping war means that no war will be localized but every war will become a world war.

It appears, therefore, extremely doubtful, to say the least, whether the enforcement of peace by means of the Covenant sanctions is feasible. Should not pacifists consider well before endorsing them? There has been one "war to end war," and one should suffice.

While the Covenant sanctions are analogous to policing, inasmuch as force is to be used to uphold established law rather than to further national self-interest, they nevertheless differ from policing in important respects. The police power is normally overwhelmingly superior to the power of the criminals it handles. The police are backed by the whole population except the criminals, and the criminals are but a small minority, for the most part unorganized individuals who can fight only a losing battle against society. Policemen themselves, while in exceptional circumstances their duty may be dangerous, have a fair expectation of life, considerably higher than coal miners have.

There is no similar disparity of strength in so-called international policing. For certain nations are so powerful that all the rest of the world could subjugate one of them only at appalling cost of life and property and the jeopardy of present civilization. This is true of the United States, the British Empire, and Soviet Russia. France, Japan, Italy and rearmed Germany are of second rank as individual powers. But any one of them, equipped with modern methods of destruction, could work terrific havoc in the world before yielding to greater might. And it is not safe to assume that any one of them would prove to be without allies.

In the Constitutional Convention of 1787 the question of sanctions in our federal union was thoroughly considered. By what method should federal law be enforced against a delinquent state? The wise framers of our government decided that the coercion of a state by the general government was not practicable. On this point Hamilton wrote in *The Federalist:*

> Whoever considers the populousness and strength of these States singly at the present juncture, and looks forward to what they will become, even at the distance of half a century, will at once dismiss as idle and visionary any scheme which aims at regulating their movements by laws to operate on them in their collective capacities, and to be executed by a coercion applicable to them in the same capacities. A project of this kind is little less romantic than the monster-taming spirit which is attributed to the fabulous heroes and demigods of antiquity.

Our Constitution has no provision for the coercion of a state by the central government, but that government may coerce wrongdoing individuals within a state, a very different thing. Said Oliver Ellsworth, a member of the convention:

> I am for coercion by law—that coercion which acts only upon delinquent individuals. This constitution does not attempt to coerce sovereign bodies, states, in their political capacity. If we should attempt to execute the laws of the Union by sending an armed force against a delinquent State, it would involve the good and bad, the innocent and guilty, in the same calamity.

Not upon collectivities—whole populations of men, women and children, the vast majority of them entirely innocent and well-meaning, however misled by vicious governments—but only upon individual transgressors can force be justly used. Policing recognizes this fact, and no law-abiding citizen has anything to fear from the police. But international sanctions, economic as well as military, disregard it and inflict suffering on innocent multitudes.

Senator Borah began his resolution for the outlawing of war thus:

> Whereas, in our constitutional convention of 1787 it was successfully contended by Madison and Hamilton that the use of force when applied to people collectively, that is, to states or nations, was unsound in principle . . .

It is regrettable that there was no Hamilton or Madison at Paris when the Covenant of the League was framed, to protest against the sanctions therein as "unsound in principle," being both impracticable because of the enormous strength of various nations and unjust because undiscriminating between innocent individuals and guilty.

In connection with the Corfu incident, when Italian bullying methods in dealing with a weak neighbor were under discussion at Geneva, Mussolini was reported as saying of the Covenant sanctions: "They were not intended to apply to a nation like Italy." A law is indefensible and intolerable that can be executed only against the weaker countries. It is not they which are most prone to aggression. Not Switzerland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, but the great and heavily armed powers, Britain, France, the United States, Japan, Russia, and Germany, menace the peace of the world and fill mankind with fear.

Sir Norman Angell is the ablest proponent of Covenant sanctions as a means of "collective security." But apparently he upholds collective war upon a faith-breaking country, not as the best course, but rather as the best that is feasible in the present state of world opinion, which is such as to make the advocacy of disarmament seem to him sheer waste of breath. For he is on record as personally in favor of complete and immediate disarmament. Though only one nation have sense enough to disarm, he would have that one nation do it as an example. I humbly hazard the opinion that it is in defending the method of sanctions that Sir Norman is wasting his breath. Before these words are in print events may corroborate this opinion.

It is by exposing the "great illusion" which war is, by demonstrating its utter futility, its colossal destructiveness, its bottomless stupidity, that this monstrous evil will be extirpated. Not by giving the monster a respectable name and bidding it to keep within the law! Collective homicide, once begun, is amenable to no law. It straightway becomes collective insanity. In the nature of the case, since human life is the ground of all values, collective homicide is the ultimate folly, whatever the circumstances.

> We want no aid of barricade to show a front to wrong;
> We have a citadel in Truth more durable and strong;
> Calm words, great thoughts, unflinching faith, have never striven in vain;
> They've won our battles many a time—and so they shall again.
>
> —Charles Mackay.

Travel Letters—I

ALSON H. ROBINSON

A good many years ago a small boy living in a remote town in the state of Maine used to wonder what it was like on the other side of the hill. It wasn't much of a hill, nor far away. But those were the horse and buggy days; and, because his father and mother took him to another part of the state before he could find out for himself, he still wonders. Now that boy, a man of middle age, has always wondered about another matter. He has wondered with all the intensity of his imagination what it is like on the other side of the world. A good many people who have been fortunate enough to see for themselves have tried to tell him about it, but he still wonders. And now because the lines have fallen unto him in pleasant places, and the horse and buggy days are over he's going to have a chance to see for himself.

At this point there are several things that I am wondering about more keenly than ever. In the first place, I wonder what it will be like to be away from home such a long time. If a New Yorker goes to visit friends in Indianapolis or Portland, Oregon, he will possibly miss certain colloquialisms which are dear to his heart and characteristic of the subway; but all the essentials, food, clothing, architecture, and, most important of all, ways of thinking, will conform to the familiar American pattern. I am wondering what it will be like not to see for a period of more than six months the *Herald Tribune,* the *New Yorker,* and particularly the *Littleton, New Hampshire Courier,* which comes but once a week, but whose omission even here might easily stir the uncertain springs of nostalgia.

I wonder what it will be like to miss the glamour, excitement and humiliation of a political campaign. To be sure, the campaign has been under way for some time; thinly but sometimes cleverly disguised in the speech and action of many men whose ambitions are turned in the direction of public office. I wonder what will happen at the Party conventions. The pity of it is that nothing has yet appeared on the horizon in the way of an opposition party. In times like these, when the Republicans are advocating States Rights and the Democrats high protective tariff, I'm probably wasting my time wondering what the outcome will be or what it will be like.

But I do wonder about the Orient. If descriptions and pictures and an entire evening's struggle with the time-table of the Royal Railways of Siam are any help, it ought not to be necessary for me to go at all. The last few years have provided a rich harvest of observations and experiences. If one cared to do so he could go back to the days of Marco Polo who in the thirteenth century wandered all over India and China and brought back to his European contemporaries remarkable tales of strange and wonderful lands never before visited by men of his own race. With the elimination both of time and space, of which the China Clipper is but a symbol, the passing years have seen an increasing flood of literature both of and from the Orient. First we have their own writers, interpreters, and leaders. For example, Tagore and Gandhi, so unalike, and yet each in his own way so indispensable to any understanding of the diverse and deeply moving currents of India. Perhaps no single aid to better understanding of the Chinese has come to us recently than Mr. Lin's *My Country and My People.* At any rate, the ubiquitous Mrs. Pearl Buck says so, and he would be most ungracious and ungrateful who failed to acknowledge the debt which the English speaking world owes to the contribution which she has made. During the next few months Kagawa is to visit our own country; first, in the interests of a better understanding between Japanese and Americans; and secondly, to spread the gospel of the Cooperative Movement. I hope his visit will be front page material, and I'm wondering to what extent the industrial leaders will see the implications of his proposals in terms of damage to the profit system.

Of course we have the Laymen's report on Missions, exhaustive, informing, and annoying to some of the oldtimers who would justify their continued support of foreign missions by insisting that it is alone "the heathen in his blindness" who "bows down to wood and stone." Incidentally, I think Mr. Charles Selden, head of the New York *Times* bureau in London, said pretty much everything which the Laymen's report said, and in many ways in a more engaging manner, in his single volume called *Are Missions a Failure?* But the Laymen's report overshadowed everything at the moment. So far as the mass of descriptions and travel experiences is concerned, the sky seems to be the only limit. And the latest contribution in some respects seems to be better than all of them; in any event, the most popular. With not the slightest effort at profundity, written by a young woman characterized by President Neilsen at the Smith College commencement last June as "the glory of her country," I suspect that it will be a long time before anybody will convey so much of the pure essence of human understanding as Mrs. Lindbergh does in her little book, *North to the Orient.*

Now with all this literature at one's disposal he ought to get a pretty good picture. I must be wholly lacking in imagination, for still I wonder what it will be like. Perhaps one of the reasons is that I have found that no matter how many books one reads, or pictures one looks at, or descriptions by persons with capacity for vivid narrative, when he reaches the spot it is a lot different than imagined. It is all very well, as did Wordsworth's "Happy Warrior," to "see what he foresaw," but you miss a lot of fun.

I sat down the other day in that "free association" attitude which used to be such important stock in trade with the psychologists. What did I think about when I thought about some of these different countries which I hope to see? First, Japan. I thought of Japanese lanterns; paper houses; the difficulty which one might encounter in such houses in getting the sort of privacy to which we are accustomed in the West. Fujiyama. Then I thought of tiny people, and association led me to the unhappy circumstances under which the Japanese exclusion act was adopted. Then remembering that at times the feeling between my own country and Japan has not been of the happiest, I wondered what it would be like to be in the country of a potential enemy. I realize that it isn't fair or intelligent to put it that way,

[This is the first of what we expect will be a series of travel letters by Alson H. Robinson, contributing editor to UNITY. Mr. Robinson is spending a sabbatical year in Japan, China and India.—EDITOR.]

since, for that matter, with our present method of settling international differences, perhaps the militarists are right in insisting that the only safe procedure is to consider them all like that. But I comforted myself with the opinion which has been expressed time and again to the effect that the Japanese are the most courteous people in the world, and I resolved that, enemy or no enemy, I should attempt to answer courtesy with courtesy.

I wonder what it will be like in China. Here's a little more free association stuff. Clouds of dust, crowds of people milling about, beautiful buildings, at least when one gets away from the western importations. Vast rivers, floods and famine, and the Empress Dowager, who did her part in preventing China from entering into a normal relationship with the development of the western world. I wonder what it will be like to be among a people whose history runs so far back in the past, a people who, as Mr. Lin says, "live the life of the senses and the life of the spirit at the same moment, and see no necessary conflict. For the human spirit is used to beautify life, to extract its essence, perhaps to help it overcome ugliness and pain inevitable in the world of our sense, but never to escape from it and find its meaning in a life hereafter." As regards North China, I can't, of course, help wondering whether we shall ever get there at all, but that's another story.

When it comes to India I suppose I ought to think of sacred cows and priests and temples, particularly the Taj Mahal, long admitted one of the seven wonders of the world, if indeed, the sacred number still holds. But I am inclined to follow Mr. Selden, who with characteristic frankness confessed that he was much less deeply stirred by the Taj Mahal in moonlight than he was at sunrise on the banks of the Ganges, watching the unnumbered pilgrims making their annual, perhaps their lifetime, visit to the sacred stream. Native Indians are probably right in their scornful attitude of tourists who make this one of the "musts" of their jaunt. The river is probably very dirty; but sanitation and spirituality, at least in acts of devotion which bring immeasurable comfort, are not necessarily synonymous.

Of course, I can't forget that here is another country in the throes of revolution. I don't want to forget. I don't wonder so much what it is like from this point of view, because it isn't the first time I've visited such places. In some countries it doesn't seem to make much difference. In Mexico, for instance, the Revolution doesn't seem to get ahead very fast. In Russia it has. Having visited both of these countries, and others also calling themselves revolutionary, it's not so difficult to visualize some of the outward aspects of such a country. But I do wonder what it will be like to meet and talk with some of their leaders, a rare privilege which the confidence of friends may make possible. I wonder what it will be like to talk to Gandhi, if he is able to see me. That privilege alone is worth a trip to India.

I wonder about a lot more things than these, but I suspect that they are sufficient to keep one person fairly well occupied for the next six months; and, when my imagination plays with them, I understand how Richard Hovey felt when he said:

"I am fevered with the sunset,
I am fretful with the bay,
For the wander-thirst is on me
And my soul is in Cathay.
There's a schooner in the offing,
With her topsails shot with fire,
And my heart has gone aboard her
For the Islands of Desire.
I must forth again tomorrow!
With the sunset I must be
Hull down on the trail of rapture
In the wonder of the sea."

In Memory of May Johnson

AMELIA SEARS

Miss Johnson's early life was spent in England. There, surrounded by an academic atmosphere, her life pattern was established. Among her paternal uncles were Cyrus Johnson, an artist; and Octavius Johnson, a librarian for many years in Cambridge University.

In later life, she returned to visit an aunt on the Isle of Wight where she was inured to the typical well-ordered life of the English leisure class.

She was educated in England and in the Chicago public schools. The family, on their settlement in Chicago, identified themselves with the First Congregational Church, in one organization of which she remained an active member until her death.

May Johnson had in her quiet way a genius for companionship, making life-long friends and living her life with a continuity of associations rare in a great city.

It was given to her to be in active work until the end. Possibly the most significant task of her life was the part she had in preparing the material for the Jane Addams Memorial Number of UNITY. That she wrought with loving care, consulting and conferring at each step, and the publication was so sure in its appreciation of Miss Addams' life, so recognizing of the qualities of the great leader, that it commanded the approbation not only of distant admirers of Miss Addams, but of Miss Addams' intimate group.

May Johnson's working life had been spent in Chicago. For a short time she was associated with the United Charities, leaving that organization to become secretary to Jenkin Lloyd Jones. She used to tell how in their first conference he said, "Are you not afraid to come down here and work with a liberal and a radical such as I?"

Her quiet acceptance of the challenge and amusement at the suggestion she could fear new ideas was an earnest of the long and successful association she was to have not only with Mr. Jones but with his successors at Lincoln Centre.

Calm and unafraid, she lived these last years with reserve and self-control. Whatever premonitions she may have had, she never let them darken the lives of relatives, friends or associates. Her unselfishness was evidenced in this as in all her relationships. The strength and beauty of her life, the quiet accomplishment of tasks given her, revealed the depth of a nature actuated by a desire to give to the world its best in unselfish, disinterested service.

A Great Indian Ruler

JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND

I know of no modern ruler who seems to me worthy of more honor than His Highness, the Maharaja Gaekwar of Baroda, the Diamond Jubilee or sixtieth anniversary of whose reign occurs in January, 1936. Not only has his reign been long, but, considering the conditions under which it has existed, its achievements have been remarkable. From his earliest manhood he has been a reformer in his very blood. He has been large-minded. He has been forward-looking. He has shown himself a born leader. He has lived not for himself alone or primarily, but for his State and his People.

He has had the handicap of being under the control of a foreign power. Nevertheless, he has persistently dared to lead his State forward to the very extremest limits of freedom, progress, enlightenment and independence. The courageous ruler of Baroda has created in his State universal compulsory education for both sexes, with the result that illiteracy there has been greatly decreased.

Nor has he stopped with this great achievement. He has made much provision for all the more important kinds of higher and advanced education. He has waged constant war against the scourge of "untouchability"; and has done much to mitigate the evils of Caste. Besides providing liberal education for women, he has legislated and in various other ways planned to give them a freer and larger life. He has been steadily active in promoting agricultural and industrial improvements, public sanitation and hygiene, creating hospitals and providing enlightened medical service for all classes of the people. With all the rest, he has given his influence steadily against religious superstitions and in favor of religious intelligence, breadth and progress, in support of social reforms, and, so far as permitted, in promotion of political reforms.

Several other rulers of Native States have advanced far in the directions in which he has moved, following in his footsteps; but he has been the leader and as such deserves the honor.

Writing as I do in America, I take especial pleasure in calling attention to certain important activities of His Highness, in which he has associated himself with us. We have in this country (or in this country and England) an organization called The World Federation of Faiths, created by two distinguished workers for the promotion of international, interracial and interreligious good will and brotherhood,—one an Indian, Mr. Kedarnath Das Gupta, and the other an American, Mr. Charles Francis Weller. In connection with the recent World's Fair in Chicago, this organization, under the vigorous leadership of these two men, held a great Parliament of Religions, lasting two weeks, with 83 notable meetings addressed by 199 speakers from nearly all the important countries of the world and representing all the world's important religions. At this Great Parliament of Religions, His Highness was the Honorary President and gave the opening address. In July, 1936, a second similar great Parliament is to be held for two weeks in London, in which he is to have an active and influential part. He is also the president of the International Council of The World's Fellowship of Faiths which has general supervision over these Parliaments and other activities.

His Highness has made several visits to America in past years and is well known and highly esteemed here. Plans are made to celebrate his Diamond Jubilee by a banquet at the Hotel Biltmore on January 28, with distinguished speakers.

Lovers of humanity and believers in human freedom, not only in India and America but in all lands, may well unite in celebrating the Diamond Jubilee of such a ruler and such a man. He belongs to the world. Civilization is more secure and all nations are richer because of him.

Prayer to the God of Lesser Evils

O Lord God of Compromise, when we are tempted to work
For radical changes subverting the customs of years,
We pray for Thy Guidance in Meeting House, Chapel and Kirk
And an *Easy Way Out* without tears.

We pray not for vision too far in advance of mankind,
Not honour nor justice we humbly beseech thee to bless:
But that waking each morning the Evils of Life we may find
Becoming progressively less.

May statesmen agree *by degrees* to abandon all war
(As burglars by stages are weaned from the practice of crime.)
May nation rob nation and men rob their brothers no more—
But certainly *Not in Our Time.*

We pray for Thy Kingdom where rich men and poor live at peace
And the eye of a needle is broad for a camel to pass,
Where prophets no longer are stoned *but respectfully cease*
From stoning our houses of glass.

R. A. Reynolds.

Three in One

There's a tree in the heart of the valley
Towering over the rest,
Straining his branches skyward
In search of infinite space.
He drives his strong roots downward
To the depths of a nether world
And draws from the rocks a vintage
That his huge shaft bears aloft.
He calls on the sun to help him
With a tremor that shivers the air,
And straightway out of nothingness
Sharp spears flash everywhere.
He calls on the sea to help him
And its waters climb heavenward unseen
Then drop to the heart of the valley
To answer the call of that tree.
The hills are kneeling around him—
The woods come crowding near—
White mists are screening the sacristy
Where dark blue shadows appear.
They know toward what he is striving
For he holds them all in thrall
To the three he has bound together—
The earth and the sea and the sun.

Flora White.

The Study Table

What Is Japan Up To?

In this day of dictators of the right and of the left, a growing indoor sport for public speakers seems to be to tell what they'd do, if they were dictators. We might as well play the game, too. So here goes. "If I were dictator," I would compel every sane adult in the United States not only to read, but also to be examined on Ambassador Saito's new volume.* Offhand, we can think of no better way to prevent any future clash in war between Nippon and the United States than to have all our citizens read this most challenging volume. Its twenty-two chapters of varying length comprise as many addresses between Oct. 11, 1932, and April 27, 1935, and one article that appeared originally in the North American Review for November, 1934. The addresses were all delivered here in America to audiences varying from the testimonial dinner to Dr. Sidney L. Gulick in Riverside Church, New York City, to the Association of Foreign Press Correspondents, and mostly during 1934-35, since Mr. Saito has become ambassador. So lucid and fascinating is his English style that one marvels at a man who has acquired such a rich command of a language not native to him.

More marvelous and challenging are the contents of the book. With a frankness that would shame many diplomats of the so-called "Christian" nations, Mr. Saito, with an innocent naivete, presents Japan's acts as necessary for the preservation of her national life, and the welfare of her millions. In all this we are reminded of a valentine sent us in our early youth. It was a red box, on the outside of which was written:

> "If some power the gift would give us
> To see ourselves as others see us,
> You to yourself would then appear
> As the likeness placed in here."

Opening the box we looked upon a red rubber lobster. Americans, beware on opening Mr. Saito's volume! How conclusively he shows that Japan is only doing what she has learned to do from western nations, including the United States! And he cites Theodore Roosevelt, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson and plenty of other influential Americans to substantiate the conclusion of his address before the Woman's Club in Richmond, Va., on April 22, 1935, "There is no need for suspicions of Japanese policies. They are based on facts. I venture to say that the policies of no other rational people similarly situated would be very different from ours. *They are the result of existing conditions.* We must exist and we must be secure. We must not menace others and we want no menace to ourselves. These are the fundamentals of our national policies." (Pages 126-7. Italics mine.)

What an indictment of our whole world "International Anarchy," based on our competitive nationalistic imperialisms in a world where machinery has made possible a plenty of raw materials and finished products for all! The indictment is all the more effective because of Mr. Saito's naivete. If he personally sees underneath to the real difficulty of the nations retaining their antiquated economic systems in the modern world of technological mass production, he does not betray such insight. He blandly assumes that all must be just as it is, "the result of existing conditions."

The challenge to Americans to change the conditions fast making for another international holocaust, compared to which the last one will look like child's play, is stirring if one understands the significance of this book. Japan appreciates America's friendship, cemented by Christmas dolls to Japanese children; instant relief at the time of the disastrous earthquake; the fine work of Americans like Henry Willard Denison, Sidney Lewis Gulick, Rudolph Bolling Teusler, not to mention Commodore Perry and others. Proof for anyone that Japan's economic interests demand peace and friendship with America is here. Could one make a better case possible for Japan than Mr. Saito does in regard to the Manchurian policy? Bringing order out of chaos in a land so bandit-ridden that a million Chinese a year now voluntarily migrate to Manchukuo makes a case at least for Japan under "existing conditions." Plenty of ammunition to refute the chauvinists and fomenters of war in our midst! A volume that all peace lovers will need to have at hand in the days just ahead, when they awake to the fact that Japan has as much right in justice to have naval parity with Great Britain and the United States under "existing conditions," as she has right to her ancestral land. Japan's desire to see navies reduced, disarmament achieved, as she proposes now at London, is predicated on her determination to have "security." And her experience, as this book makes very clear, is that she knows she cannot always trust the so-called "Christian nations." They have attacked her shores too often for her to feel safe, unless she has an equal navy. Let's equalize the navies and then . . . SCRAP THEM ALL. Let's make good on Ambassador Saito's opening compliment to all genuine Americans, "It is one of the many admirable American traits always to be ready and even eager to listen to what the other side has to say." Get the book and hear a master saying it!

War!

In this most recent volume† from the pen of the leader of the Socialist Party in America, we have most clearly stated the many arguments why civilization must get rid of war,—all except the religious argument. This, however, does not lessen the value of the book, nor make it any the less a genuine contribution to war and peace literature. For many minds it may enhance its value just for this reason.

How war itself may mean the utter ruin of civilization is graphically made clear in the first chapter, entitled "War as Soldiers Know It." A survey of some of the high lights from the war literature penned by those who went through its hellish holocaust, such as W. N. Ewer, Norman Archibald, Eric Remarque, Henri Barbusse, almost canonized as a saint in the galaxy of humanitarian pacifists, Siegfried Sassoon and Humphrey Cobb, helps to make this chapter, as in fact the entire volume, a real mine of pacifist ammunition in the fight to end war.

Mr. Thomas also knows the terrible ravages of war on what Leyton Richards in *Realistic Pacifism* has called "The Home Front." Of these he treats in the next chapter, "Keeping the Home Fires Burning." Into the almost unbelievable capacity of Americans to swallow propaganda, he dives. Justly stinging is this shot at the preachers: "It was respectable, even ad-

*"Japan's Policies and Purposes," by Hirosi Saito, Japanese Ambassador to the United States. Marshall Jones Co., Boston. $2.50.

†"War, No Profit, No Glory, No Need," by Norman Thomas. Frederick A. Stokes Co., New York. $1.50.

mirable, to enjoy an orgy of collective hate of the enemy; with us, of the Kaiser or the Hun. Preachers enthusiastically shared in it and smacked their lips over atrocity stories—for some of these men of God, the more sadistic the better." (p. 39.) Without naming him, although most of us know well who he is, for he has not only "lived to regret it," but has become a spearhead in the fight against war, Mr. Thomas, with that gentle sarcasm of which he is a master, tells how this theologian did "take time to explain that it was possible to love your enemy even while you were bayoneting him, and that the Christian doctrine of immortality made it easier for the soldier to send his Christian brother, so unfortunate and so misguided as to be in a German uniform, to an untimely death. The theologian illogically was exempted in England and America from illustrating his argument with his own bayonet." (p. 40.) Has this, among other reasons, been why Norman Thomas has left the church's ministry?

"The Next War," infinitely worse perhaps then "the First World War," as that disaster was worse than any preceding big war, shows Mr. Thomas at his best in his realistic understanding that war today can bring no glory, will profit the common people of no nation, but must ruin victors and vanquished alike. He makes good his point that even in the "First World War," as he repeatedly calls it, the military folk did not know what to expect, nor what else to do much of the time than just send men over "the top" to their doom. The military mind could think of nothing else to do and must be doing something. His discussion of the differences that the so-called military experts have among themselves as to the character of "the Next War," is valuable for any citizen who wants to really know what to expect.

Mr. Thomas' book is exceedingly valuable for the tie-up between the capitalistic system and the war machine. "The next war, so far as the United States is concerned, is not in the least likely to be a defensive war against aggression. It is a war into which we will be drawn by some high pretext of saving civilization, but in reality to serve the usual economic interests. We shall go to war in the Far East 'to preserve the open door in China,' or 'to protect civilization against Japan.' Or perhaps we shall be drawn into a European war to protect a very profitable trade with one group of belligerents." (p. 77.) One must go to the book to get the detailed proof on all this.

Yet Mr. Thomas is alive to the danger of the conflicting nationalism within the capitalistic order as causes of war. He refers often to "the entire capitalist-nationalist system of whose evil fruits war is only one and the worst"; (p. 146.) and equates this system with "the capitalist imperialism under which we live." (p. 187.) Although leader of the Socialist party in the United States, he sees clearly that the danger of war would not be automatically removed if America turned Socialist. Ample proof from Russia, Germany, etc.

Space simply prohibits any adequate revealing of the wealth of peace ammunition in the chapters, "What Have Men Gained by War?" "Why Men Fight," and the "Cure for War." The review of the many reasons given by all sorts of folks as to why men fight, with Mr. Thomas picking out like a true eclectic the grain of truth in each with his synthesis, is worth the price of the volume many times. When he comes to "The Cure for War," we find this tried and trusted leader of American Socialists a veritable generalissimo for the forces that must "wage peace." To sum up, we must attack the war system on all fronts and keep everlastingly enlisted for the duration of this war against war, until the competitive order that breeds the poverty from which war is a welcome change to multitudes is replaced by a cooperative order. He pays his respects very rightly to "the hysterical nationalist appeals of William Randolph Hearst and Father Coughlin" for their having scared the people about our entering the World Court. (p. 185.)

In "A Postscript on War and Revolution," Mr. Thomas rightly in our judgment warns against the use of violence in the struggle to replace capitalism. His picture of how any civil war with modern machines of mass murder would be even more horrible, be that possible, than an international or world war, is not in our judgment overdrawn. "Some type of violent revolution is more probable than peaceful revolution, just as new international war is more probable than peace. But here, also, probability is not inevitability. While there is any hope at all, men who know the dreadful implications of organized large-scale violence—that is to say, of war—will seek by every means in their power to avoid it even in the service of the noblest ends." (p. 220.) And we suspect that, although he does not reveal it in this volume, down deep in Norman Thomas is the conviction born of religion, that in this fight against war and capitalism we must "obey God rather than men."

The book simply ought to be in the hands of every genuine lover of his country, whether pacifist or non-pacifist. It is clear, incisive, realistic. Mr. Thomas has a happy faculty of slipping in for the reader's thought what ought to be done, even as he is treating so realistically the actual situations. In every way a one hundred per cent book for patriots!

The Church and the World

This volume* by three of our country's young Christian theologians is provocative and challenging enough, so that one understands why it was the Religious Book Club selection for October. In a brief review like this, one might say that its analysis of "The Crisis of Religion," the title of its first chapter by Wilhelm Pauck, is, on the whole, excellent, and in itself will repay a careful reading of the volume. While the book is a unity, all three authors having a similar point of view, it is not written in such a way that the reader does not know who is responsible for any particular statement. H. Richard Niebuhr pens the introduction, "The Question of the Church," and the concluding Part III, "Toward the Independence of the Church." Professor Pauck writes Part I, as noted, while Francis P. Miller contributes Part II, "American Protestantism and the Christian Faith."

In conclusive fashion our authors show that the church has brought on its own "crisis," in that "it has identified itself too intimately with capitalism, with the philosophy of individualism, and with the imperialism of the West." (p. 11) These men know, as one would suppose all are coming to see, that Christian Churches have been weighed in the balance and found wanting, as in Russia, Spain, Mexico, Germany, and likewise, although less spectacularly, in England and America, mainly because they have joined in the world's idolatry of our conflicting nationalisms, racialisms and industrial

*"The Church Against the World," by H. Richard Niebuhr Wilhelm Pauck and Francis P. Miller. Willett, Clark and Co., Chicago and New York. $2.

imperialisms. Perhaps one ought not to expect too much from them as to the way out for the church and religion, for at the outset, we are told that they "are seeking not to expound a thesis but to represent a point of view and to raise a question." They raise questions and some strange ones. Dismissing fundamentalism, of course, as useless in toto to help, they direct their darts at modernism and humanism, as well as Barthianism and Buchmanism. To the latter two they are more friendly than to modernism and humanism, although recognizing that Barthian theology "has been a powerful influence upon the religious life of our time, because it teaches us to take God seriously in his divinity." (p. 66) Why they hit modernism and humanism so hard becomes apparent when Mr. Miller defines what they mean by "Christian faith." These men have been inoculated with the Barthian bacillus, all right. Their first assumption is "that the object of the Christian faith is a Reality which has an existence of its own and is not to be identified with your existence or my existence or with the world or universe in which you and I live and move and have our being." We had supposed that long since theologians had been freed from the bogey of a transcendental as distinguished from an immanent God. When Jesus taught and convinced men by his life that God is love, did he want folks forever to wonder whether the love in their hearts was God's love or their own human love? Didn't Jesus even pray that his disciples might be one, not only with one another, but with God, that he (Jesus) and God and all men might be one together in love, of course? No wonder these men, while admitting, to be sure, his fine contribution to education and philosophy, attack so vigorously John Dewey, as typical of Humanism. How long will Christian theologians feel they must follow the general lines of the Pauline-Augustinian slant to Christian theology, when Jesus said as plainly as words can say it, "By this shall all men know that you are my disciples, if you have love one to another?" (John 13:35)

In the end our authors only add more confusion to our religious situation, already more confused than there is any need of its being, if Christian thinkers really became Christian rather than Pauline in their thinking. What after all is the Reality that Christianity ought to be forever seeking, if it is not a world in which men will learn increasingly to live together in good will and cooperation each with the other? Thus a Hindu like Gandhi or a Jew like Rabbi Stephen S. Wise will not be asked to go through the emotional and intellectual gymnastics of becoming in name a Christian. All such will be recognized by all Christians as kindred souls, just as truly disciples of the Way of Love as though they named themselves Christians. It is this getting muddled eventually in just such academic and metaphysical questions that makes the book as keen a disappointment in its conclusions as it is a delight in its analysis of the disastrous union between capitalism and the church.

GEORGE MAYCHIN STOCKDALE.

Portrait of Jesus

This* is a fresh, stimulating, and delightful approach to the study of Jesus. It is the result of mature, scholarly thinking and a warm sympathetic appreciation of the Great Teacher. In a unique fashion the writer permits the Bible record to present a portrait of Jesus. There are no explanatory comments but by a skilful selection of passages and organization of them under suggestive titles the old records take on new meanings. Criticism will undoubtedly be leveled at this selective process but it seems to the reviewer that Dr. Sharman has been very careful to be true to the spirit of the passages in their original settings and nowhere does there seem to be any attempt to use scripture in the proof-text way of supporting a particular theory. There is undoubtedly a personal screening of passages that may be challenged. For instance, in the section on "Opinions About the Worth of Jesus," one misses the reaction of the masses such as Mark voiced when he said, "the common people heard him gladly." Other omissions might be noted but the book does not pretend to be an exhaustive delineation of Jesus as Teacher. It is representative, suggestive and a stirring portrait of Jesus. The volume is printed in a hand-set type, unusually attractive, which anyone could enjoy reading.

Dr. Sharman is a New Testament student who has taught in the universities of Toronto, Chicago and Peking. He conducts a six weeks seminar of an international group each year on the life of Jesus and this volume is an outgrowth of twelve of these seminars.

E. J. CHAVE.

*"Jesus as Teacher," Henry B. Sharman. Harper and Bros., New York, 1935. 172 pp. $2.00.

Progressive Religious Education

These booklets† are "the first of a series edited by Sophia Fahs, Rev. Edwin Fairley, Adelaide Case, "to describe activities in progressive religious education; they represent a wide range of interests and describe character building processes in which spiritual values are recognized and encouraged." Each booklet exhibits, almost stenographically, successive class sessions of actual courses, conducted as projects. Each could be placed in the hands of an inquiring teacher in any liberal Protestant church school, with some exceptions for No. 3, which is, in content, Unitarian. If the students *must* be beguiled into intensive study of the early Hebrews, No. 1 presents the best way to beguile them. Religious knowledge, of course, rather than the development of character and social attitudes, is the chief objective. On the other hand, Unit Number 2 is admirably contemporary and practical. A vacation school group of fourth to ninth graders is moved to improve their very neglected neighborhood—sewerage, garbage collection, poison ivy in lots, etc. It is all very exciting and inducive to civic pride, responsibility and collaboration. Vital learnings, in attitudes and information, are innumerable. Unit No. 3 is quite different from the others. A group of older children is prompted to compose a children's day pageant that will bring out the specific Unitarian message, as taught by Channing, Emerson and Walt Whitman (!). Much interesting and relevant history and literature come to view and an unique though talky and philosophical "pageant" evolves. (Dubious drama, however!) Channing, Emerson and Whitman, garbed in academic gown, cap and hood (!) in turn ascend the pulpit and so many high, noble, abstract convictions are voiced that one doubts if the "specific Unitarian message" can be identified at all! Would it not have been better to focus the pupils'

†"The Life and Religion of the Early Hebrews," by Emily F. Ellis. Beacon Press Unit No. 1 in Religious Education. 8 vo. 44 pp. 68 cents.

"Making a Better Neighborhood," by Thelma J. Burdick and Josephine Gifford. Unit No. 2. 60 cents.

"A Dramatic Service of Worship," by Catherine M. Conradi. Unit No. 3. 68 cents.

attention upon one outstanding incident where Unitarian principles were dramatically wrought into deed?

But to illustrate modern methods of education, the booklets are better, because briefer, than even "Exploring Religion with Eight-Year-Olds." Helpful bibliographies conclude each.

CHARLES LYTTLE.

America's Debt to Göttingen

In these days of surging nationalism, a book like this* is almost a necessity. We need to be reminded that we are not self sufficient. We need to be told that our spiritual heritage must always be international and without boundaries. How true all this is of American culture. It is not only our debt to Greece and Rome, but also our debt to all Europe and Asia and the rest of the world. We are truly debtors to all men; this may be our glory. And now at the right moment Professor Long comes with this timely book: *Literary Pioneers*. He might have called it Our Debt to Göttingen.

We have here six portraits of American spiritual pioneers, George Ticknor, Edward Everett, Joseph Green Cogswell, George Bancroft, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, and John Lothrop Motley. All these men had much in common. They were contemporaries, New Englanders, all studied at Göttingen, all introduced German thought into America, and all helped to build a tolerant, cosmopolitan American attitude.

It is now one hundred and twenty years since the first American students began going to Göttingen. They have never stopped going, and let us hope they may always continue. Göttingen in 1815 when Ticknor and Everett entered its hospitable doors offered everything that young America needed. Not far away was the great Goethe whom all wished to see. One of the interesting points in this book is the influence the sage of Weimar had on our early life. Everybody of any cultural importance in the nineteenth century wanted to read him or to interpret him. It is surprising to note how eagerly he responded. Always interested in America, he gave his time and attention to the Göttingen students. Motley was the only one to reach Weimar too late to see him, but Tieck received him with cordial helpfulness and did for him what Goethe would have done had he been alive. Americans have always found encouragement and a sympathetic understanding with Germany's greatest men.

Edward Everett was the first American to receive the degree of Doctor of Philosophy from a German University, when on September 17, 1817 Göttingen conferred on him the coveted degree. Like Ticknor he returned to Harvard to the delight of the students. Emerson's formative years were guided to a large extent by these two great teachers. From them he hungrily drank in the new learning. If Emerson had had an opportunity to learn German he too would have gone to Göttingen. As it was he never quite appreciated Goethe although he tried desperately to do so.

When Bancroft went to Göttingen in 1818 he took with him the young Frederick Henry Hedge. The latter studied at the famous Schulpforta and then at Göttingen and became one of the greatest of the interpreters of German thought to America. Professor Long should have included a chapter on Hedge. Let us hope he will follow this book with another in which he will do justice to the much neglected but highly important Hedge.

The gradual understanding of Goethe in America as the result of the work of these Göttingen students is the important contribution of this study. Goethe drew them all to him, but Puritan New England feared Goethe. Emerson, in spite of Carlyle's insistence, never quite overcame this fear. But in the effort to understand Goethe American literary criticism had its birth.

John Lothrop Motley stated the case for his generation:

> "In so far as this charge [Goethe's disregard of morality] rests on the want of a distinct moral aim in his works, we regard him as fully justified, on this ground . . . that morals and aesthetics constitute two distinct provinces. A work of art is perfect, when it is perfectly conformed to the rules of art. With the laws of morality it has nothing to do, except so far as they are implied in those of art. It is absurd to demand of an artist that his work should inculcate *a moral* . . . But on other grounds we do not know that Goethe can be entirely justified from the charge of 'lukewarmness of moral sentiments'."

Today every college and university in the United States studies Goethe. Every theological seminary teaches the results of German scholarship. Eichhorn and Schleiermacher were the two most noted teachers of religion contemporary with Goethe. Both these names have become household words to every intelligent student of the religious background of American letters. And it is to these literary pioneers of whom Professor Long writes that we bring our gratitude for the interpretation of these men into American thought. Verily, "the Renascence of New England" came by way of Göttingen.

CHARLES A. HAWLEY.

Protest Against War

Mr. Tomlinson's book,† *Mars His Idiot,* is a work of genuine literature. It has especial significance as the work of one of the great literary artists of our time. It would seem to indicate that England is profoundly disturbed—indeed, frightened—by the imminence of war and its possibilities of final havoc. A year or so ago, Beverley Nichols issued his terrific *Cry Havoc,* and at about the same time A. A. Milne devoted his exquisite talents to his forthright book on *Peace with Honor*. This fall Mr. Wells put out his scenario novel, *Things to Come,* and now Mr. Tomlinson follows with this volume on *Mars*. When authors of this calibre turn aside from their creative work to set down in burning words their horror and denunciation of war, it means something. And we think it means that the next war has become so immediate a prospect that these Englishmen think nothing else is worth doing but understanding and, if possible, preventing this awful calamity.

Mr. Tomlinson's book is difficult to describe, and its power impossible to convey. It represents a combination of beauty and horror which makes it an altogether unique and surely unforgettable masterpiece. There are sentences all through the book that have the majesty of Milton, and others the ethereal splendor of Shelley; and always there is the cold, almost icy, precision of a Mill or a Huxley. The clarity of this writ-

*"Literary Pioneers, Early American Explorers of European Culture," by Orie William Long. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts. 266 pp. $3.00.

†"Mars His Idiot," by H. L. Tomlinson. Harper and Brothers. $2.00

ing is overwhelming—it blinds and dazzles, and then illuminates like the blaze of pure, white light. Mr. Tomlinson would have us know what war is, whence it comes, and what it does, and will do if it comes again. There is no question, when we have finished these pages, as to what we have seen. The nerves are shaken by the sheer terror of it all, and yet the heart uplifted that man's mind can thus face reality and still aspire to ideals. This book is as magnificent as it is frightful. The author of *The Sea and the Jungle* and of *Gallion's Reach* has here written his greatest pages, because he has been moved more profoundly by the fate of Europe than by tropic night and ocean storm.

In form, *Mars His Idiot* is a series of meditations, from five to twenty pages long, on various phases of war and peace. The book, in other words, is a collection of essays, in which a brilliant mind plays like lightning through the black firmament of European doom. Mr. Tomlinson was in the last war, and he leaves no doubt as to what that war was. He has studied and here surveys the military machinery now at the disposal of mankind for the next war, and leaves no doubt as to what this next war will be. He thinks it will mark the end of everything—that we need not fear revolution as the aftermath of the next war, as there will not be enough left, he suggests, to revolt over. The coming of war he sees as the outcome of the anarchy of international affairs, the working out of policies of imperial interest, preparedness, etc., which make inevitable the very war that all men pretend to dread. He pours out a contempt upon the stupidities of the statesmen who produce wars, which is matched only by his contempt for the stupidities of the generals and admirals who fight them. He sees an excellent way of preventing war in making the statesmen and the soldiers personally responsible for war the first victims of its horror. The people, he is certain, would not fight if they were not deceived, betrayed, browbeaten, and enslaved by the artificial and wicked entities which we know as governments. He sees the next war coming in exactly the same way the last war came, and calls it all a gross insanity which may perhaps reconcile the observer to the extinction of so mad a world. But his heart breaks for the helpless and innocent folk who must pay in their own fleshly agony the price of this infernal idiocy. But the price will not have to be paid but once again. It will be all over this next time. War will not leave even women's eyes to weep.

The literature of pacifism is immeasurably enriched by Mr. Tomlinson's great work. If anything could persuade men's minds, and therewith gain the goal of peace before it is too late, it would seem to be a book of this impressive type. As one turns the pages, and at the same time listens with each paragraph to the guns and bombs in Ethiopia, one is reminded anew of Wells' thought of modern history as "a race between education and catastrophe."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

The Witches' Sabbath

Huysman's *La Bas,** masterwork of fantasy and horror, comes to us in a sumptuous new edition from the Black Archer Press. Not to consider too curiously this renowned terror spectacle (and only hinting at its unearthly wonders), a few words concerning it are not inapropos, especially in view of recent reports of widespread devil-worship in Paris today.

A study in soul-isolation, this book, concerned with a French prosateur who, while engaged in writing a life of Giles de Rais, France's Bluebeard, discovers (as so often happens in such cases) that the idea creates the actuality:—and, from those cloistered vigils beneath his study lamp, finds himself drawn by association into the inferno of the Sabbath. His adventures in that far-off world of weirdness, fantastic erotica, and murder, follow each other in rapid succession: while weaving his prose tapestry of Lucifer, Durtal, the hero, also makes a most sinister arras in black and scarlet from his amours with a married woman, intimate of a Satanist clique, who lures her lover into the net—and the whole swirls swiftly along, colorful with medieval pageantry and Paris boudoirs, to its unbelievable climax: the Black Mass, the Holy of Unholies, the final and ultimate apotheosis of Satan. . . .

Such is *La Bas;* as we promised at outset, we shall say very little about it. It is not for us to lift the curtain on this sanctuary of horror, this deification of the Devil. Our readers, if they would do so, must obtain the work and read it for themselves. It is indeed a consecrated shrine, where sits enthroned that Dweller on the Threshold whose very shadow should blast men's souls; and, who contrary to general understanding, still numbers his devotees by the million, adored by them with fire, blood, and rapine; and whom, only too glad to escape from the presence thereof, we salute: "Ave Sathanas!"

ROBERT C. SCHALLER.

*"La Bas," by J. K. Huysmans. The Black Archer Press, Chicago, 1935. $3.00.

Correspondence

A Tribute to May Johnson

Editor of UNITY:

Although it was not my privilege to have personal acquaintance with May Johnson, of the staff of UNITY, and even my correspondence with her over a brief period some three or four years ago was concerned primarily with my desire to be of service in the circulation of UNITY, nevertheless her passing has affected me with such a sense of loss that I am asking the space for a brief word, with others, in remembrance of one who made more than a casual impression upon me.

The people whose passing leaves "an empty space against the sky" for me are not so much the people of public reputation as the men and women who carry the burden of unknown service through years of patient faithfulness that seeks no reward, other than the reward of living for the common welfare. There is a fragrance about such lives like the scent of new mown hay, or the wide reaches of the orange groves in Southern California, a fragrance made of many contributions rather than of some one rare flower. It is one thing to "mount up with wings, like eagles," it is yet more, perhaps, to add to the note of ecstatic experience the needed activities which go with the worthwhile enterprise, that is, "to run and not be weary," but it is even more, as the great scripture from which I quote sug-

gests, "to walk and not faint." Even so was her glory, a glory to be compared with that of the "unknown soldier" only so far as the incident of obscurity is common to both, but greater by as much as the kind of service May Johnson did was that of the "unknown servant of humanity." There is a touch of heartache in me, also, that she is gone, with a sincere rejoicing that her work lives after her.

ROBERT WHITAKER.

Los Gatos, California.

A Reply to Mr. Brown on Sanctions

Editor of UNITY:

Mr. H. Runham Brown, in your issue of December 16, illustrates the most hopeless trait of humanity, the tendency toward perfectionism—the belief that only the perfect and certain course, which implies no risk, must be adopted. The plain fact is that there is no certain course of action, nor one without risk.

Mr. Brown's lengthy list of dangers illustrates this point of view but every radical, even the progressive movement, is cursed by it—that's why the many are always held in subjection to the few. These take the risk, and rule. The many cannot win because they demand a certain and a riskless position, which in fact does not exist. And, to dodge action, these perfectionists always cite the arguments of reaction, as when Mr. Brown repeats in substance Mussolini's talk of the crimes of other countries.

Mr. Brown sets forth various kinds of gloom. There is no chance for the Abyssinians, either for their lives or their independence, so Mr. Brown thinks. In fact, there is no truth in his conclusions. The Abyssinians will fight, and the Italian outlook is desperate. Meanwhile the sanctions are doing their deadly work and only one thing, utter wreck for Mussolini, can be certainly counted on.

Nothing suggested has any hope in it, so Mr. Brown tells us. Then why does he waste time and good paper and ink in telling us that nothing can be done? He says we ought to build a "real League of Nations," in which "each Empire renounces its claims and shares its opportunities with its neighbors." Certainly this is an admirable thing to hope for. But out of what shall this League be built? It must be out of the present Empires, or not at all. Mr. Brown insists that there is no chance of their doing anything even toward less Utopian plans. Why does he dally with the impossible?

In fact, how can such a League be brought about? How, if Italy were a member, could her acceptance of Mr. Brown's program be secured? Or if England is as hopeless as Mr. Brown thinks, how can she be brought to support such a League? Evidently, it is hopeless to expect a voluntary acceptance. And, if not voluntary, how can it be brought about? Evidently by some sort of pressure, sanctions; and Mr. Brown says these lead to war and hence are taboo.

Mr. Brown's plan, therefore, is merely a little more difficult, a somewhat more risky method of doing the job, and he will repudiate that also as soon as any serious attempt to apply it is made. Its merit is that it does not present a present challenge to do anything.

Man is not a reasoning animal. His only title to respect is that he will sometimes fight for what he believes in. Courage to take risks is the highest attribute of man as he now is.

EDWARD M. WINSTON.

Chicago

Forthcoming Articles

ETHIOPIA AND INDIA. Jabez T. Sunderland

IN NERVOUS SCANDINAVIA..... .....Synnove Larsen Baasch

HITLER'S GERMANY. Frederick L. Schuman

A YANKEE'S WAY TO "UTOPIA"..... .....David Gittleman

(On the Fiftieth Anniversary of the creation of Edward Bellamy's "Looking Backward.")

FOOL-FORCE.....Harold P. Marley

"MAN, THE UNKNOWN"—ALEXIS CARREL .....Taraknath Das

CONDITIONING THE MIND TO EXCITING WORDS.....John Malick

WASHINGTON—ON WAR AND PEACE .....Edwin D. Mead

BITTERSWEET (A Story of the Depression) .....Gilbert Oberweiser

Subscription Appeal

The most effective subscription appeal is that made by readers to their friends.

Each reader of UNITY is *urgently* requested to secure at least *one new subscriber* within the next thirty days.

What UNITY has meant to you it will mean to many of your friends.

Use the attached form.

SUBSCRIPTION ORDER BLANK

Please enter the following subscription to UNITY:

Name .....

Street and No.....

City.....State.....

$3.00 for a year's subscription.
($3.50 in Canada; $4.00 in other countries.)

☐ Remittance enclosed. ☐ Send invoice.

The Field

(*Continued from Page* 182)

good commentary on the Church to notice the program in the celebrations during November. Here are some of the subjects:

Nov. 3—"The Christian Church and the Social Question."
Conference, "The Church and the New Day."
Nov. 10—"The Two Religions — Force and Persuasion."
"Is There a Social Conscience?"
Nov. 13—Jubilee Dinner.
Nov. 17—"Preacher and Prophet."
"Evolution and the Christian Church."
Nov. 19—Australian Church Players—A three-act play: "The Lonesome Club."
Nov. 23—"Obstacles to Religious Life and Progress Today."
"Worlds Not Realized."
Conference after Evening Service on "Further Penal Reform — A Borstal Institute for Victoria." This was led by Samuel Mauger, one of Australia's most leading citizens, and once Postmaster General.
Nov. 27—Annual Meeting of the Church, the chief topic being "Practical Suggestions for Next Year."
Nov. 30—SOCIAL EVENING for Younger Folk in Lecture Hall."

In all the above services, with but two exceptions, this sturdy Scot of over 85 was the preacher! He was active in all the meetings! The readers of UNITY may remember that when it is November in The United States, it is May in Australia!

A correspondent from Australia reports that the "depression" is still in the land, business is "bad" with "thousands out of work." The contribution that the Australian Church at such times makes to the country and world is not insignificant.

SIDNEY STRONG.

Gandhi Receives Margaret Sanger

India is not faced with combating opposition to birth control but with the problem of training doctors and nurses, and organizing clinics, according to word received from Margaret Sanger at her National Headquarters in Washington. Mrs. Sanger spent two days with Mahatma Gandhi, discussing all aspects of the birth control question, and also visited Tagore, who is entirely sympathetic with her efforts to better the condition of women. During her stay in India, as part of a world tour, she has already addressed a meeting of the Muncipality of Bombay, at which the Mayor was the chairman, conferred with the Governor and given a radio talk which was broadcast from Bombay as far afield as Colombo and Delhi. Five hundred doctors attended a showing of a technical movie which had been prepared for the purpose at Mrs. Sanger's New York clinic, and other showings of the film and large public meetings are scheduled before her departure for China.

As to how immediate and necessary birth control is for India, one has only to walk through the side streets of Calcutta or Bombay, or into any small village and look at the teeming masses of poverty-stricken, starved, emaciated men, women and children, to be convinced that birth control is of world-wide importance, according to Mrs. Sanger.

"It is clear that for India, birth control methods will have to be of the simplest and cheapest kind," she writes. "In Bombay I visited the tenement houses inhabited by the poorest families, and adults and children alike look miserable and undernourished. We asked the women, squatting before their squalid huts how many children they had living, how many dead. Then we asked how many more they wanted and all except one said: "Please God. no more." In Bombay, at night, even in the European quarter, I have seen hundreds of people sleeping in the streets. It is stated authoritatively that over 200,000 people in Calcutta sleep on the ground as they are too poor to live in homes."

At the All India Women's Conference, representing twelve million women, and meeting in Travancore December 28th to January 2nd, Margaret Sanger was the guest of honor and feature speaker. In addition to her international activities, Mrs. Sanger is president of the National Committee on Federal Legislation for Birth Control in this country, and leader of the movement to liberalize the restrictive postal laws on birth control.

—*National Committee on Federal Legislation for Birth Control.*

Jane Addams

Another incident may be related to indicate the wide range of her influence. It was related to me by a university professor of Political Science, who, with Jane Addams, was invited to have dinner with Theodore Roosevelt on one occasion before the latter was to speak in the Chicago Auditorium in the evening. As the three were riding down town, T. R. said:

"Miss Addams, what do you think of woman's suffrage? Are you for it?"

"Yes, Mr. Roosevelt, I think I have always been a suffragist. It seems to me to follow as a necessary corollary of democracy."

"You think it would work, do you?"

"Well, it might work almost as well as manhood suffrage has worked."

In the midst of his evening speech, Mr. Roosevelt brought his right fist down into his left palm with much emphasis, shouting, "Woman's suffrage is only a logical part of democracy," then going on to repeat the very words Miss Addams had used an hour before. Of course this went at once into the papers and had great influence all over the country. Theodore Roosevelt always thereafter spoke of her as the one who had converted him in five minutes to woman's suffrage.

—*Caroline M. Hill in The American Friend.*

In the Winter Issue of

The New Humanist

C. HARTLEY GRATTAN
The So-Called Humanism of Paul Elmer More

RELIGION'S GREATEST ADVENTURE
Harold P. Marley

MYSTICS, AUTHORITARIANS, AND THE HUMANIST TRADITION
R. Lester Mondale

WHAT THINK YE OF THIS CHRIST? —A POETIC SEQUENCE
Homer C. House

THE PHILOSOPHY OF A HOTHOUSE RELIGION
Howard Davis Spoerl

COLLECTIVISM OR STATE CAPITALISM?
Roland R. Renne

MORMONISM AND ITS FIRST PROPHET
Alexander P. Cappon

BARRIERS TO KNOWLEDGE
Max Kaufman

A WIDE RANGE
Llewellyn Jones

Special to UNITY readers: A free copy of "THE NEXT STEP IN RELIGION," by Roy Wood Sellars, 228 Pages, with a subscription to THE NEW HUMANIST at $1.50. Enclose 15c in stamps for postage.

Yearly $1.50 **Per Copy 25c**
Canadian and Foreign $1.75

Raymond B. Bragg, Editor
Edwin H. Wilson, Managing Editor

Published six times a year by

THE HUMANIST PRESS ASSOCIATION, Inc.
330 South Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois